

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-19, 32, 34, 36 and 37 and rejected same. With this paper, claims 19, 34 and 37 are amended, none are added and none are canceled.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With this paper, claim 19 is amended according to the Examiner's suggestion on page 2 of the Office Action.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-2, 7-8, 11, 13-17, 19, 32, 34 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh-Yang *et al.* (US Patent 6,351,820, referred to as Oh-Yang hereinafter) in view of Khouli *et al.* (US Patent 6,308,278, referred to as Khouli hereinafter).

Claim 1 recites a method for changing a mode of a card connected to an interface of a terminal. The card comprises at least one dormant mode and a normal mode. A command for setting the normal mode is transmitted to the card to change the mode of the card from said at least one dormant mode to the normal mode. The card generates an interrupt request related to the change in the mode of the card, to be transmitted via the interface to the terminal at the stage when the card shifts to the normal mode. The interrupt request, received from the card and relating to the mode change, is processed in the terminal.

The Office acknowledges that Oh-Yang does not teach "wherein the card generates an interrupt request related to the change in the mode of the card, to be transmitted via the interface to the terminal at the stage when the card shifts to the normal mode," and "wherein the interrupt request, received from the card and relating to the mode change, is processed in the terminal" as recited in claim 1, but cites Khouli for teaching a system control interrupt (SCI) signal generated

by a LAN controller to wake up the computer. Therefore, "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time of the invention was made to include Khouli's SCI signal into Oh-Yang's card." Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states the following:

Khouli teaches a system and a method comprising:  
a plurality of peripheral devices including a local are(a) network (LAN) controller (Fig. 2, ref. 237);  
when the LAN controller is shifted to a wake mode from the standby mode, a wake control signal, such as a system control interrupt (SCI) signal, is generated and transferred to the power management device to wake up the computer (Fig. 5 and col. 6, ll. 1-14).

It is clear that the Examiner relates the peripheral devices (such as a LAN controller) to the card, and the computer to the terminal, of the claimed invention.

In the claimed invention, a command for setting the normal mode is transmitted to the card to change the mode of the card from a dormant mode to the normal mode. This means when the command for setting the normal mode is transmitted to the card, the card may be in the dormant mode. The mode of the one that transmits the command to the card, e.g. the interface of the terminal, is not relevant.

There is no indication that the LAN controller in Khouli has at least one dormant mode and a normal mode, and, therefore, there is no mode setting in the LAN controller that is controlled by a command transmitted from the computer.

Claim 1 recites that, "wherein the card generates an interrupt request related to the change in the mode of the card, to be transmitted via the interface to the terminal at the stage when the card shifts to the normal mode." Unlike in Khouli, where the SCI signal is generated by the LAN controller to wake up the computer, the interrupt request of the present invention is not for the purpose of waking up the terminal, because the mode shift is not related to the terminal but to the card.

Claim 1 further recites, "wherein the interrupt request, received from the card and relating to the mode change, is processed in the terminal." This step cannot be related to any process in the computer of Khouli. In the present invention, the interrupt signal indicates that the card is

ready (the card shifts to the normal mode). Also, the term “is processed” in the claim has different meaning than the term “wake up” in Khouli.

Based on the foregoing, Oh-Yang and Khouli, alone or in combination, do not teach all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, the present invention, as claimed in claim 1, is not obvious over Oh-Yang in view of Khouli. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 7 recites a system, 13 and 16 recite a card, 17 recites a terminal, and 19 recites a mobile station. All of them correspond to the method of claim 1. Since claim 1 is believed to be patentable, these device claims are also believed to be patentable. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 7, 13, 16, 17 and 19, as well as dependent claims thereof, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Office also rejected following claims:

On Page 16, claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh-Yang and Khouli and further in view of Robinson *et al.* (US Patent 5,303,352).

On Page 17, claims 4, 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh-Yang and Khouli and further in view of Kihara *et al.* (US Patent 6,212,097).

On Page 18, claims 5, 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh-Yang and Khouli and further in view of Lindskog *et al.* (US Patent Publication 2002/0132603).

The above claims are dependent claims of one of the independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 17. Applicant respectfully request the rejections of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn for the reason of being dependent from one or more of patentable independent claims.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims in the application are allowable, and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's attorney urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

4 OCTOBER 06

Date

Ware, Fressola, van der Sluys & Adolphson LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468-0224  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Customer No.: 004955

Respectfully submitted,

Francis J. Maguire

Francis J. Maguire  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 31,391